DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 201 JC 980 350

TITLE	Good Practices for Course Approval Processes. Adopted Spring 1998.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *College Curriculum; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; Educational Objectives; *Educational Policy; Guidelines; State Curriculum Guides; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Carnegie Unit

ABSTRACT

This report makes recommendations to create specific categories and approval processes for special topic courses, experimental courses, an expedited process for courses with imminent need for approval, and independent study courses. Further recommendations are made for policies and practices related to the Carnegie Unit, the relationship between hours of student work and units earned: (1) create separate standards and procedures for determining student units and faculty load; (2) establish standards for granting Carnegie Units to courses based on performance criteria; and (3) assure that the board policy establishes expectations for the unit/hour relationship but maintains flexibility. Guidelines also are suggested to streamline the workload of curriculum committee meetings. These guidelines include a full review for substantive curriculum changes, approval on the consent agenda for minor changes, and information-only status for technical changes. (EMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 201

Good Practices For Course Approval Processes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. M. Silverman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Adopted
Spring 1998

JC 980 350

Good Practices For Course Approval Processes

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Adopted Spring 1998

1997 - 98 Curriculum Committee

Beverly Shue, Chair, Los Angeles Harbor College
Luz Gomez Argyriou, Napa College
Donna Ferracone, Chafton Hills College
Jean Smith, San Diego Continuing Education
Jannett Jackson, Fresno College
Linda Lee, San Diego Miramar College
Bob Stafford, San Bernarndino College
Ron Vess, Southwestern College
Lynn Miller, Chancellor's Office Liaison

1996 - 97 Curriculum Committee

Bill Scroggins, Chair, Chabot College
Luz Gomez Argyriou, Napa Valley College
Donna Ferracone, Crafton Hills College
Jean Smith, San Diego, Continuing Education
Jannett Jackson, Fresno City College
Linda Lee, San Diego Miramar College
Bob Stafford, San Bernardino Valley College
Ron Vess, Southwestern College
Marissa Alvarez, Student Senate

Table of Contents

Abstract 1

Introduction 2

Special Topic Courses 3

Experimental Courses 4

Expedited Course Approval: Imminent Need 5

Independent Study 6

Carnegie Unit 7

Changes Which Trigger Course Outline Review 9

- Full Review by the Curriculum Committee: Substantive Changes 9
- Approved on the Consent Agenda: Minor Changes 10
- Information Item Only/No Action: Technical Changes 10

Recommendations on Changes in Curriculum Policy and Procedures 11

Appendix 13

ABSTRACT

A well-designed college curriculum is not only comprehensive and effective but also flexible. As new topics emerge and demands of the field evolve, the curriculum must be responsive without losing its commitment to quality.

This paper makes recommendations to create specific categories and approval processes for:

- special topics courses,
- experimental courses,
- an expedited process for courses with imminent need for approval, and
- independent study courses.

Further recommendations are made for policies and practices related to Carnegie Units:

- separate standards and procedures for determining student units and faculty load,
- establish standards for granting Carnegie Units to courses based on performance criteria (open entry/open exit, independent study, and distance education), and
- assure that the Board policy establishes expectations for the unit/hour relationship but maintains flexibility.

Guidelines are also suggested to streamline the workload of curriculum committee meetings:

- full review for substantive changes,
- approval on the consent agenda for minor changes, and
- information only status for technical changes.

Colleges are reminded that recommendations on the changes in policies and procedures as recommended here fall within the purview of the academic senate.

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum committees continually face challenges to balance deliberate review–and its emphasis on quality--with responsiveness to quickly emerging curriculum needs. Likewise, curriculum committees must weigh the need for a well structured college curriculum with the advantages of flexibility in covering disciplines-specific topics. All of this has to be maintained within a reasonable workload for the faculty and the committee. This paper addresses several strategies that are recommended to discipline faculty and curriculum committees to allow flexibility while maintaining high standards.

- Many departments offer special topics courses whose content changes from semester to semester. While such courses add valuable depth and breadth to the curriculum, the review of the content and appropriateness of these courses must remain rigorous.

- Particularly in fields experiencing rapid change, faculty need to experiment to develop appropriate and effective ways to convey new material. Similarly, the diversity of backgrounds and learning styles of today's students calls for the development of new pedagogies that may take some time to work out. While the ability to offer experimental courses is critical to this process, such courses must still be completely described and must meet required standards.

- The Academic Senate's previous paper, *"The Curriculum Committee: Role, Structure and Function,"* stressed the importance of an annual cycle of curriculum development, review, and approval. Circumstances arise that require quick response or a review at times not prescribed by this cycle. The curriculum processes should accommodate such imminent needs but set criteria to assure that such requests are appropriate.

- Independent study provides a valuable avenue for individual instruction beyond the scope of the regular curriculum. Many colleges list such courses as part of the departmental curriculum. While regulations provide some guidance for the use of independent study, the experience of faculty has led to some good practices that are important to share with others.

- The relationship that three hours of student work per week over the term of a full semester equates to one Carnegie Unit of student credit is established in regulation. Translation of these weekly hours to in-class lecture/lab/studio/activity/discussion and out-of-class homework/study/activities is left to local governing board policy. The expansion of modes of delivery, short-term courses, and open-entry/open-exit designs has generated some new issues worthy of discussion.

SPECIAL TOPIC COURSES

Special topic courses, as specified in this document, are those with a consistent pedagogy--as described by a complete course outline of record--but with a focus area which changes from term to term. One example is a course on Latin American History for which the objectives, assignments, and methods of instruction and evaluation are specified and consistently used, but the focus shifts each semester, perhaps from Argentina to Bolivia to Columbia and so on. The reading list would change as well but be sufficient to support the content: political history, social history, economic history, etc. Another example is an English Literature course in which the author of the works studied is different with each offering. The goals and structure of the course remain consistent: critical analysis, a certain amount of reading and writing, a research paper with specified parameters, and so on.

This degree of specificity for the special topics course outline of record gives the curriculum committee the essential information to review the appropriateness, need, quality, feasibility, and compliance with state and local standards, including articulation. Special topics courses are not a carte blanche to offer "current topics" or whatever subject the discipline faculty may desire: history of the French Revolution one term and of the Boers in South Africa the next. Special topics courses should be differentiated from experimental courses. They have a stable, well-defined form and purpose within the program, rather than requiring experimentation to resolve design or other features of the course. As can be seen, allowing for a separate category of experimental courses will meet that need. Blanket approval of a special topics course is not a way to avoid cumbersome course approval processes. If there truly is a justifiable imminent need for a new course, the curriculum process can be responsive to that need in an expedited manner to be described shortly.

It is recommended that colleges adopt a policy specifying that special topics courses require full course design and pedagogy, changing only the focus area each term. The change in focus area and reading list need not require curriculum committee action but rather should be reported as an information item. It is recommend that the committee specify a uniform course number for special topics courses. In this way, students, faculty and others will know that Biology 96 or Sociology 96 at your college will be on special topics. It is recommended that each iteration of the course be given a unique letter: History 96A on Argentina, 96B on Bolivia, etc. The focus area and reading list for each letter used can be appended to the overall course outline. Only the generic outline of record needs to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

The use of multiple letters for the course is preferable to a single course number specified as repeatable. Because each lettered iteration is a separate course, the number of offerings is not subject to the limit of four repetitions (in regulation for a single course designation), multiple letters also provide unique transcript entries to keep track of the focus area taught in a given term. This will facilitate articulation. The catalog listing can be limited to just the number designation, History 96 for example, with a notation that the focus area will be different each term as listed in the schedule of classes.

In reviewing courses proposed as special topics, curriculum committees should apply all relevant standards. Special attention should be paid to the range of focus areas planned. They should be closely related and effectively taught using the standard course design in the outline of record.

EXPERIMENTAL COURSES

Circumstances arise in which all aspects of a course cannot be anticipated without offering the course on a trial basis. Such experimental courses are still required to have a complete course outline and go through the regular college curriculum review process. They must meet all Title 5 requirements, and they must be recommended by the curriculum committee and approved by the local governing board.

Curriculum committees can grant some latitude, however, in the extent to which the course meets the five criteria for course approval published in the *Curriculum Standards Handbook*. Some examples will illustrate the point.

- Appropriateness to mission may be in doubt for a course intended to be transferable that has not yet been articulated. It may be that the curriculum committee would recommend approval contingent on that articulation and a review of any changes that might be needed to secure that status.
- Need may be questionable if student demand seems marginal. The only way to ascertain that response may be to offer the course on a trial basis.
- Assessment of quality for an experimental approach, such as collaborative instruction or service learning, may await actual evaluation during the course itself.
- Feasibility may be uncertain if cost and enrollment factors are unknown.
- Compliance with laws and regulations always should be ascertained and not be a basis for experimentation unless waivers of those laws or regulations have been obtained (for example, as allowed for CalWORKs if faculty senate concurrence is obtained).

It is recommended that colleges adopt policies and procedures for experimental courses that clearly state that statutory and regulatory standards are to be upheld but granting latitude to proposed courses for which the *Handbook* criteria are in doubt. Such proposals should be accompanied by a written rationale stating the area in need of experimentation, the plan to resolve the uncertainties, and an appropriate timeline. The rationale must show that needed information is dependent on trial offering of the course, not just that the originator has not done the work to address the criteria. Approval should be recommended by the curriculum committee for a limited period of time, typically not more than a year. Approval should be contingent upon resubmission of the course, with unresolved areas addressed, at the end of this period.

As with special topics courses, it is recommend that the college use a consistent number for experimental courses. In this way everyone will know that Anthropology 55 or Photography 55 is an experimental course. A notation should be placed in the catalog that these courses are

experimental. Such courses must be approved by the local governing board but are listed generally, not separately, in the catalog. Experimental courses are not accepted to meet general education or program major requirements for associate degrees or certificates nor are they to be submitted for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) approval. They may be accepted for elective credit for the Associate Degree or for elective credit at the California State University (CSU).

EXPEDITED COURSE APPROVAL: IMMINENT NEED

Curriculum committees hear time and again that curriculum review processes are slow, cumbersome, and a hindrance to the ability of the college to be responsive to the rapidly changing needs of business and the community. At the same time curriculum committees continually fend off challenges to the quality of community college curriculum, with recent occurrences being questions from four-year receiving institutions about the appropriateness of some of our telecourses and the CalWORKs requirement that community college educational programs be approved as eligible for placement of students by county welfare departments.

Curriculum processes can balance responsiveness with quality assurance by establishing an expedited process when imminent need for a course is established. One example of an imminent need might arise from an accreditation visit to a nursing program from which an immediate curriculum change is required by the Board of Registered Nursing. Another example arose when CalWORKs required integration of basic skills and program major instruction as a condition of approval for programs to receive client referrals by a stated deadline. Imminent need should not be invoked just because the course originator did not prepare adequately to meet the established curriculum review timeline.

It is recommended that colleges adopt imminent need criteria which, if met, would qualify a course for expedited approval. Upon presentation of a complete course proposal, the curriculum committee would accept, review, and approve or disapprove the course at its next regularly scheduled meeting, regardless of the adopted annual timeline. Faculty originators would be expected to submit a written rationale addressing the imminent need criteria and the committee would, as a first order of business, accept or reject the rationale.

Courses accepted for expedited approval must still meet all state and local standards, including submission of all required forms. It is expected that the faculty originator(s) would be present to address any issues raised by the committee. It is essential that expedited approval not lower standards or submit to pressure from special interest groups to establish curriculum which has not been well thought out.

The expedited process still requires that the course be recommended by the curriculum committee and approved by the Board of Trustees before it is offered. Some colleges have local policies that require courses to be included in the catalog before they can be offered. However,

Title 5 §58104 permits courses which are approved after the publication of the catalog or schedule of classes to be offered if they are "reasonably well publicized." The Chancellor's Office has traditionally interpreted this to mean that every course must be publicized via a printed announcement with general distribution. Thus courses approved through the expedited process can be offered, even after the deadline for catalog publication has passed, by listing the course in the schedule of classes. Even in the rare case that a course would be approved after the schedule is prepared, the course may still be given if the college has a well-designed process for publicizing these courses to the general population. Faculty should realize, however, that the catalog is extensively used by other institutions to evaluate transcripts. Many four-year colleges and universities require transferable courses to be listed in the catalog as a condition of articulation. It is recommended that, as good practice, newly approved courses be listed in the schedule of classes and as a catalog addendum. If expedited courses meet the relevant standards, they may be approved for Associate Degree and certificate requirements and be submitted for the University of California (UC) transferability, CSU GE-Breadth, and IGETC approval.

INDEPENDENT STUDY

Independent study courses are intended for one-on-one or small group instruction, research, or activities beyond the scope of currently offered courses. Independent study course structure is based on a contract among the college, faculty member, and student. The same standards apply as for other courses: a qualified instructor, course quality, adequate instructor-student contact, and evaluation and grading of student performance.

It is recommended that colleges adopt policies and practices assuring the appropriateness and quality of independent study. Independent study should require minimum qualifications within that discipline for faculty delivery of the course. Curriculum committee review of the independent study contract is not required or expected. It is recommended that the proposed contract undergo administrative review to assure that Title 5 regulations and local board policies are followed, not to assess the pedagogy or relevance of the course content itself. Local policies and practices should set standards for adequate instructor-student contact, for reporting of grades, and to meet regulatory reporting requirements for the college to obtain apportionment funding. Units awarded should continue to follow the Carnegie relationship. Compensation for faculty is a matter for negotiation for districts with the bargaining agent. Independent study courses are not assigned to individual faculty but rather are elected voluntarily by faculty on the basis of their own interests or needs.

For disciplines whose faculty regularly make use of independent study, it is recommended that a generic description be published in the catalog. It is recommended that colleges adopt a standard number so that all who see such a listing know that Electronics 96 or Anthropology 96 is an independent study course. Independent study courses should be accepted as elective units for the Associate Degree and designated as transferrable to CSU for elective credit.

CARNEGIE UNIT

The relationship between hours of student work and units earned is known as the Carnegie formula. As specified in Title 5 § 55002 (b)(1)(B), it is:

> Units. The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course requires a minimum of three hours of student work per week, per unit, including class time and/or demonstrated competency, for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term, laboratory, and activity courses.

Notice that the regulation requires the Board of Trustees to adopt a policy specifying the relationship between units and lecture and/or lab hours or performance criteria. The total is to be three hours of student work per week over a full semester to earn one unit, but those "hours of work" can be in the classroom or outside. It is that division which the local board policy should address. This section will discuss some good practices for that task.

The relationship between hours and units is further delineated in Title 5 §55002.5:

> One credit hour of community college work is approximately three hours of recitation, study, or laboratory work per week throughout a term of 16 weeks. Where a term is more or less than 16 weeks, more or less than one credit hour shall be allowed in the same ratio that the length of the term is to 16 weeks.

For work experience courses, the relationship is that one unit of credit is earned for each 75 hours (paid) or 60 hours (unpaid) of work experience activity within a semester, as stated in Title 5 §55256.5:

> (a) One student contact hour is counted for each unit of work experience credit in which a student is enrolled during any census period. In no case shall duplicate student contact hours be counted for any classroom instruction and Cooperative Work Experience Education. The maximum contact hours counted for a student shall not exceed the maximum number of Cooperative Work Experience Education units for which the student may be granted credit as described in section 55256.5.
>
> (b) The learning experience and the identified on-the-job learning objectives shall be sufficient to support the units to be awarded.
>
> (c) The following formula will be used to determine the number of units to be awarded:
>
> (1) Each 75 hours of paid work equals one semester credit or 50 hours equals one quarter credit.
>
> (2) Each 60 hours of non-paid work equals one semester credit or 40 hours equals one quarter credit.

It is important to immediately recognize the relationship between categories of student time spent in lecture/lab/discussion etc., and the faculty load earned for compensation purposes. These two issues, student hours and faculty load, are distinct, and colleges are cautioned against applying a single standard to meet both needs. An example will help to illustrate the point. A semester-based course is offered with a three-hour lecture and three-hour lab each week. The faculty determine that two hours of outside study are needed for each lecture hour but not a substantial amount of outside work is needed each week for students to keep up with the lab. The Carnegie relationship thus determines that students will earn one unit for each lecture hour and one unit for the three lab hours for a total of four units. Suppose that the bargaining agreement has specified how faculty load is determined. This means that the number of class hours, as lecture or laboratory, will affect such load. However, there might be variations in load considerations that not only include lecture and lab hours, but also preparation time and/or evaluation of student work (e.g., composition classes). The decision for student units is an instructional consideration, i.e. an academic and professional matter, and should not be connected to the decision on faculty load, which is a bargaining issue. The point is that the decision for student units is not and should not be connected to the decision on faculty load. The curriculum approval process and the determination of faculty compensation should follow distinctly separate processes. Curriculum committees must not become involved in faculty load issues!

In evaluating a course for purposes of awarding student units, curriculum committees should consider both the specified in-class hours and the expected out-of-class hours. Note that Title 5 § 55002, requires substantial student assignments to be performed outside of class. It must be clear upon review of the course outline of record that the total of in-class and out-of-class work totals three hours per week for each semester unit. If that level of work is not apparent, originating faculty should be asked to provide further information.

Recall that Title 5 allows for the granting of units based on performance criteria specified in the course outline rather than hours of student work. This method is most appropriate for open entry/open exit, independent study, and distance education courses due to the fact that these types of courses do not have regular weekly meeting hours. It is recommended that curriculum committees require a written rationale for such courses specifically detailing the expected hours of student work. Note also that funding of such courses follows different standards. For the most part, open entry/open exit courses require positive attendance accounting while independent study and most distance education courses follow an apportionment formula based on equating units to hours (see Title 5 § 58051 in Appendix A).

It is recommended that the local board policy required by Title 5 § 55002, not be overly prescriptive. The policy should require that each course outline of record contain sufficient information to ascertain that students must perform three hours of work each week for each semester unit of credit. It is recommended that the policy specify that the normal expectation of the Board is that, for a semester-length course for each week:

- one hour of lecture = one unit of credit,
- three hours of lab/studio/shop/activity = one unit of credit,
- one, two, or three hours of quiz/discussion = one unit of credit as specifically justified in the course outline,
- study and homework do not generate credit units, and
- open-entry/open-exit, independent study, distance education and other courses based on performance criteria require a written rationale specifying the expected hours of student work to earn the proposed units of credit.

Units for courses with term lengths other than a full semester will be prorated based on the above relationships. Proposals for units not following the above relationships must be accompanied by a written rationale. A possible format for the rationale might be for the instructor to estimate the typical number of hours that a student would spend to work on each content area. Recommendations for student units for each credit course will be made by the curriculum committee.

CHANGES WHICH TRIGGER COURSE OUTLINE REVIEW

To streamline the course approval process, it should be recognized that not all changes in the course outline of record are of equal impact. Full curriculum committee review should apply only to those changes which require re-evaluation of criteria to assure that standards in Title 5 and the *Curriculum Standards Handbook* continue to be met. To that end, the Academic Senate proposes the following guidelines for curriculum committee action on proposed course changes.

Full Review by the Curriculum Committee: Substantive Changes

"Full review" means a complete analysis of the entire course outline of record by the complete curriculum committee and a motion for approval by the full committee. The following substantive changes should trigger a full review:

- major change in Catalog Description, Objectives, or Content which
  - alters the need or justification for the course
  - calls into question the ability of the course to meet standards in Title 5 or the *Curriculum Standards Handbook*
- change in units and hours
- number of repetitions
- credit/no credit status
- prerequisites (separate review required by Title 5 §55200)
- distance education mode (separate review required by Title 5 §55376)
- offering a course in experimental status
- determination of imminent need to initiate expedited approval

All proposals should be submitted with the written rationale for the change.

Approved on the Consent Agenda: Minor Changes

Changes which do not affect statutory or regulatory curriculum standards, but require judgment of the extent to which this is true, can be placed on the consent agenda for full committee vote. It is recommended that a prior review take place to recommend that the course changes are such that standards are not affected. At most colleges this review can be done by division faculty or a technical review subcommittee of the curriculum committee, but should not be just an administrative review. Members of the full curriculum committee are expected to read the revised and previous course outlines and the accompanying rationale. They may pull the item from the consent agenda for discussion if necessary. Otherwise, no comment is needed prior to a full committee vote.

It is recommended that the following minor changes to the course outline of record be approved on the consent agenda as recommended either by vote of the division faculty or the technical review subcommittee:

- minor, non-substantive changes in Catalog Description, Objectives, or Content (see above "full review"),
- change in course number (within college policy),
- change in course title,
- add/drop from an Associate Degree or certificate program (must continue to be of two year or less duration), and
- add/drop from the Associate Degree general education list.[1]

Again, a written rationale should accompany all proposed changes.

Information Item Only/No Action: Technical Changes

Some changes are technical in nature and require no review. Others are within the areas of the course outline for which a variety of methods are permissible, provided that the course objectives are met and the course content covered.

It is recommended that the following changes be accepted as information items only, with no action required, upon the advice of the division/departmental faculty or technical review committee. Revised course outlines should be transmitted so that the course file can be kept up to date. Technical changes include:

---

[1] The expectation is that the change in general education status would be based on well established criteria for each general education area, reviewed and recommended either by divisional faculty or a general education subcommittee.

- changes in term length (as long as the Carnegie relationship is maintained),[2]
- changes in the Text and/or Instructional Materials,
- changes in the sections on Methods of Instruction, Assignments, or Methods of Evaluation (as long as these changes are minor and continue to enable students to meet objectives and fully cover the stated content), and
- addition of a focus area to a special topics course list for the next letter in the sequence.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON CHANGES IN CURRICULUM POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The changes that are suggested in this paper fall within the scope of the academic and professional matters on curriculum. As such, recommendations to the local governing board or its designee should be made by written resolution of the local academic senate. The local academic senate may charge the curriculum committee or some other academic policy committee with the task of developing a proposal for these changes, but final recommending authority rests with the academic senate. The extent of the changes suggested here would have a substantial effect on staff and students. Therefore, the local academic senate must take steps to assure the effective participation of staff and students, as determined by their recognized representative bodies.

---

[2] In some cases, term length changes may affect pedagogy. For example, condensing a semester length course to two weeks or an exclusive Saturday format would trigger the need for review of course structure.

APPENDIX A

Title 5 §58051. Method for Computing Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES)

(a)(1) Except as otherwise provided, in computing the full-time equivalent student of a community college district, there shall be included only the attendance of students while they are engaged in educational activities required of students and while they are under the immediate supervision and control of an academic employee of the district authorized to render service in the capacity and during the period in which he or she served.

(2) A community college district may also include the attendance of students enrolled in approved courses or programs of independent study, including courses or programs formerly conducted as coordinated instruction systems, who are under the supervision, control, and evaluation, but not necessarily in the immediate presence, of an academic employee of the district who is authorized to render such service. Such attendance may only be included for college level credit courses and programs which are accepted for completion of an appropriate educational sequence leading to an associate degree, and which generally are recognized upon transfer by institutions of the University of California or the California State University.

The community college district shall determine the nature, manner, and place of conducting any independent study course or program in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to implement the purposes of this Subsection. The rules and regulations shall require community college districts to ensure that the components of each individual study course or program for each student shall be set out in a written record or program, including the number of units and hours of study required, the arrangements for consultation with the instructor, the work product to be evaluated, and the college facility required. The rules and regulations shall also provide for input from, and participation by, faculty, who are selected by academic senates or faculty councils, and students, in the development and evaluation of approved educational courses and programs.

(3) A community college district may also include the attendance of students enrolled in approved distance education independent study sections in accordance with the provisions of Section 55316.5(a) and (b).

(b) For the purpose of work-experience education programs in the community colleges meeting the standards of the California State Plan for Vocational Education, "immediate supervision" of off-campus work training stations means student participation in on-the-job training as outlined under a training agreement, coordinated by the community college district under a state-approved plan, wherein the employer and academic school personnel share the responsibility for on-the-job supervision. The student/instructor ratio in the work-experience program shall not exceed 125 students per full-time equivalent academic coordinator.

(c) For purposes of computing the full-time equivalent student of a community college district, attendance shall also include student attendance and participation in in-service training courses in the areas of police, fire, corrections, and other criminal justice system occupations that conform to all apportionment attendance and course of study requirements otherwise imposed by law, if the courses are fully open to the enrollment and participation of the public. However, prerequisites for the courses shall not be established or construed so as to prevent academically qualified persons who are not employed by agencies in the criminal justice system from enrolling in and attending the courses.

(d) Notwithstanding Subsection (c) and any regulations related thereto, a community college may give preference in enrollment to persons who are employed by, or serving in a voluntary capacity with, a fire protection or fire prevention agency in any course of in-service fire training at the community college in cooperation with any fire protection or fire prevention agency or association. Preference shall only be given when such persons could not otherwise complete the course within a reasonable time and when no other training program is reasonably available. At least 15 percent of the enrollment in in-service fire training courses shall consist of persons who are neither volunteers of, nor employed by, a fire protection or fire prevention agency or association, if the persons are available to attend a course. Full-time equivalent student for the courses shall be reported for state aid.

(e) Subsection (d) shall apply only to the following:

(1) Community colleges which, in cooperation with any fire protection or fire prevention agency or association, have been, as of January 1, 1980, the primary source of in-service fire training for any fire protection or fire prevention agency or association.

(2) Community colleges which, in cooperation with any fire protection or fire prevention agency or association, establish in-service fire training for any fire protection or fire prevention agency or association which did not have in-service fire training, prior to January 1, 1980.

(f) In the event that in-service training courses are restricted to employees of police, fire, corrections, and other criminal justice agencies, attendance for the restricted courses shall not be reported for purposes of state apportionments. A community college district which restricts enrollment in in-service training courses may contract with any public agency to provide compensation for the cost of conducting such courses.

(g) Positive records of student admissions and full-time equivalent student in all in-service training courses in the areas of police, fire, corrections, and other criminal justice system occupations, as described in Subsection (c), shall be maintained by each district and shall be separately reported annually to the Chancellor's Office.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code. Reference: Section 70901, Education Code.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
910 K Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-4753 Fax: (916) 323-9867 E-Mail: asccc@ix.netcom.com
Web Site: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us